DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 824 HE 001 091

By-Lerner, Max.

The Colleges and Universities and the Urban Crisis.

American Coll. Testing Program, Iowa City, Iowa.

Pub Date 6 May 69

Note-25p.; Speech delivered at the American College Testing Program Conference in Iowa City, Iowa, May 6, 1969; to be published in forthcoming ACT book CHALLENGE AND OPPORTUNITY: HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE 1970's

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.35

Descriptors-*Activism, *College Students, *Ghettos, *Higher Education, Inner City, Negroes, *Social Change, Violence

Identifiers-*American Dream

America is experiencing its most rapid change over, and it is necessary that this change be contained in a meaningful way. The main thrust of our recent changes has been in the direction of an erosion of belief in the American dream on the part of college students and ghetto residents. If the heart of the American experience is to be "access", then equal opportunity for equal life chances must be provided for all. The inner city revolution is part of a deeper and continuing "uprooting revolution" which violates the organic health of individuals, the community, and nation. Television has had a revolutionary impact by implying that fulfillment of desires can be instantaneous. Trust and communication are 2 crucial factors in the relationship of society to students and ghetto residents. However, this trust has been broken, and the result has been activism, often violent. Activism is good, but it should be preceded by reflective thinking. There are 7 theories that attempt to account for violent activism. Much of this activism has been directed toward destroying the organism of the university. Constitutional structures must be revised, and a new setting must be created within which the teaching and learning processes can proceed in a healthy way. Change can be effected if collective intelligence and will are used. (DS)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED032824

Dr. Max Lerner

"THE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AND THE URBAN CRISIS"

Today is a time of testing--the testing of institutions and leadership, testing to see whether our cities are viable, whether our colleges can really function, whether our democratic processes can contain the revilutionary changes that are taking place. As I've traveled around the world a bit I've found some of my friends saying to me, "Mr. Lerner, this reactionary America of yours" and I say "Wait a minute--if you mean you don't like some of the decisions of our leaders, that's your privilege, some of us don't. But if you mean that America is itself a reactionary society then watch out. It isn't so. It's probably the most revolutionary society in the world today." This always rocks them back on their heels--America revolutionary.

Then, of course, I have tried to point out there are two basic meanings of revolution. One is the classical historical meaning--overthrowing the regime, subverting the society by direct action of planned violence. The other, much more important--an accelerated pace of change inside of the society, without violence, at least with violence only very, very marginal. Without violence, a pace of change so rapid as to achieve a whole succession of break-throughs. This gives new levels from which further changes take place.

And it's in this sense that America is the most revolutionary society in the world today. Much more so than those that call themselves revolutionary--Communist Russia, China, Cuba. We're far more revolutionary,

AE 001 091

because in those countries when changes begin, they are not allowed to work themselves out. In our country, which is still a tolerably open society, they do work themselves out. They work themselves out all the way, and that's our concern, of course, now. We're trying to see how they're going to work themselves out. A little like that song, "June Is Busting Out All Over." America is busting out all over. We're bursting at the seams. We're a little like Pandora's box--box of the winds. The winds were let out and they can never be put back into the box. And the winds are out. The question is what do we do.

This is not simply a question of whether these changes in our society that have been going on now for some time, they preceded the college malaise, the college unrest, they preceded the war, they preceded the draft, they preceded all of that.

I did a book on American civilization at the end of the 1950's. I was describing changes that had been going on since the end of World War II. Obviously, if I were to do a revision, as I hope to do, I should point out that in the last ten years the changes are even more rapid. America has been changing very rapidly, more rapidly than any other civilization in the world. The real question is whether we have been changing adequately, and in the right direction, and whether these changes continue to take place within the basic structure of the linkage of human being with human being. Or will these revolutionary changes, in the second sense of the term, spill over into the first sense? I mean the planned and violent subversion of a regime and of the whole society. I hope we will be hospitable to change. I hope also we

will have the kind of collective will to contain these changes so that they take place within not only the rule of law, but the rule of ideas. There's no way of telling.

You see, when people say to me, "Are you an optimist or a pessimist?" I say, "What do you think this is, Wall Street? Do you think this is a question of whether I am bullish or bearish about the gyrations of stocks on the stock market? I'm neither an optimist nor a pessimist; I am a possiblist. I think it's going to be possible to contain these changes. But that doesn't mean it's guaranteed. That depends on our collective intelligence and our collective will."

Peter Drucker has done a remarkable book on what he calls the "discontinuities" that are now going on in American society. The Age of Discontinuity he calls it. I suppose he means the same by discontinuities as I mean by revolutionary changes in this second sense of the term revolution.

That is, when you look at our history you see, obviously, a line of continuity of change. But when the changes get very accelerated, and they escalate, then you get not so much continuity as discontinuity--you get a break in continuity. And these changes are now putting a strain on personality structure in the United States (the "American character") and on institutions and legal processes and codes.

This is pretty much what I want to talk about. I talk about it not as some of our friends of the extreme right do, who set their faces stonily against change of any kind. Nor do I speak of change in the sense of some of my friends on the far-out left, who make a cult of violent change, and seem

to get some kind of emotional charge by being some way associated with violence. They have a romantic feeling about violence, almost the sense that there is a purging effect in it. I don't go with that. I've read too much of history, I've seen too much of what violence has done to believe that there is any kind of purging, releasing impact to mass violence. And so I say the frame within which I want to talk is that of generosity toward change, trying to contain it in some kind of meaningful way.

The main thrust of our recent changes, obviously, has been in the direction of an erosion of belief. I had a friend, Harold Laski, who was one of the important intellectual leaders of the British Labor Party. I remember his saying toward the end of World War II, "When the leaders of the people ask their followers to die for a dream, those followers have a right to know in whose behalf the dream is being dreamt." In every civilization that's worth anything there is, at the very core, a dream. When we talk of the American dream, what do we mean? We mean a vision of social possibility, how life can be lived on this continent. There has been continuity in that dream ever since the first American revolution, and the Jeffersonian revolution, and the Jacksonian and all the rest right up to the present time. The real question is in whose behalf the dream is being dreamt. In two areas of our lives, in the inner-city ghettos and on college campuses today, this question is being asked in a mocking and derisive way. In the inner-city ghetto it is being asked by young people who come from underprivileged groups. It is being asked on college campuses mainly by the sons and daughters of privileged groups.

The fact that they are asking this question is an important fact, because it represents an erosion of belief in the authenticity and validity of the American dream. We're not going to be able to speak of social peace until we have recast that dream and made it credible. Which means, incidentally, making our civilization viable. As you look at the history of great civilizations that lived, prospered, flourished, died the lesson we can learn from them is not that we shall die from poverty or from too little power or from the thrust of barbarians outside our walls. Nothing like that. I think our great vulnerability comes within our walls, in terms of the erosion of belief. If we can make the dream credible, then I think we will have achieved something.

People say America is a sick society. I don't think it is. There are sick ideas in the society, and sick groups, but I don't think that in itself it is a sick society. I think it is a tragic society, tragically split. I take the meaning of tragedy from a German philosopher, Max Scheler. He did some essays on Greek tragedy in which he pointed out that the protagonists are not evil: they are men of high purpose aiming at very high goals, especially justice. But as they aim at these goals they come in conflict with the laws of the Gods--life and society--and they destroy something more precious than which they are pursuing.

That, to me, is the nature of the tragic experience as we are living it in our country today. I see very few evil men on either side of the barricades. I see men of high purpose within their own minds, seeking what seem to them to be lofty goals. But I also see these men in conflict with

the laws of life of the society, which enable a society to survive. I see them destroying the fabric of the society itself. I find that particularly true on college campuses. America is today a split and wounded society. The question is how do you heal those wounds? As a possibilist I think they can be healed, with time and intelligence and will. But it is not guaranteed.

Let me say a few words about the inner-city revolution. It's part of a much broader and deeper uprooting revolution that has been going on for some time. We are being uprooted from the farm, from the land, from the small town, from the city neighborhood, from religious institutions, from codes of sexual behavior, from esthetic codes. We're part of a deep uprooting, and the inner-city is part of it. What we have now in the inner-city is the product of two vast geographical movements which came pretty much at the same time, not necessarily related to each other. One was the movement by American Negroes out of the southern communities into the big industrial centers of the north, and the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. The other was the movement of many middle-class whites out of the city into the suburbs--the suburban revolution. These movements have left the city as it is today with a very different kind of population composition. The inner-city is now very largely devoted to non-whites, and to the impoverished groups who have missed out--on freedom, on jobs, on power, on income. They came to the cities originally for the same thing that has drawn people to cities for centuries--looking for work and excitement, and for other people of their own kind.

If I may quote from myself, I did an unconscionably long article for the quarterly scholarly magazine, "Daedalus," in an issue called The Conscience of the City--an article called "The Negro American and his City." The subtitle I used was "Person in Place in Culture." I think it's necessary to see not just the American Negro, but other Americans, too,. in these terms--Person in Place in Culture. What the American Negro wants and needs is a sense of himself as a person, his identity and worth, his dignity and pride. But he is not an atomistic individual. He is somewhere--in place, in that city and that neighborhood. He needs roots and pride in it. But he is also in culture. In two cultures, actually--his own, with its cultural tradition, and in the larger American culture. He needs freedom to move around. We need, along with him, to break the ghetto trap so that he can move around. But if he wants to stay wherever he wants to stay, he must find roots and a sense of identity and a pride in himself and in the cultural context that he's in.

You see, I take basically an organic approach to the whole civilization process. I do not take a mechanistic approach; I take an organic approach. As persons we are organic beings and we live as part of organisms. The family is an organism, college is an organism, the city is an organism, the neighborhood is an organism, the society is an organism. You cannot tear an organism away from its roots. But neither can you treat an organism as if it were a mechanical thing.

It is only in the last few years that this has become the weight of my thinking. I am convinced that much of what is happening today is in violation

of the organic health of the individual, the community, and the nation--which includes the inner-city and the college campus. Oscar Lewis did a very famous, by now classic, book called La Vida, a study of Puerto Ricans both in Puerto Rico and New York City. He pointed out something which we've very much, I think, very much taken to heart. I, by the way, as President White has suggested, came with my family from Russia and was of a Jewish ghetto, one of the older ghettos of New York City. There are the newer ghettos now, the black ghettos, the Puerto Rican ghettos, the Mexican-American ghettos and so on, the newer ghettos. As Oscar Lewis points out, in both ghettos there was an economy of poverty. In the newer ghettos there is also cultural poverty. In the older ghettos there was no cultural poverty, there was a culture of richness. It's a very crucial difference, because in the family and neighborhood in which I grew up, while there was plenty of poverty, we had to hold together as a family against the hostile environment and it gave us a cohesiveness that many families today lack.

There are two differences between the older ghettos and the new ones. Of course, we in the older ghettos did not have the heritage of slavery to carry and we in the older ghettos did not have the badge of color. Those two differences make all the difference in the world. And that makes the whole process so much more difficult. If you look at what I call the career line of the young American Negro growing up in the ghetto, as you look through his early life, see what happens to him, what are the formative influences? The first: Home or what counts as a home, in an unstructured

family, with the most important single thing in it being the television set. Television has had a more revolutionary impact on the inner-city ghetto than on any other part of American life. For the first time they've got a window to look out at society. The second has been the streets. The street has not always been--oh, what shall we say, in our terms--antiseptic. There has been prostitution, there's been dope addiction, rackets, violence. And the third is the school. The school has become very often an angry school, and an angry classroom, and all too often the young Negro child commutes between the world of the school, a middle class world, and the world of the home and the street, which is not a middle class world.

But outside of all of them, through the TV set, he sees the larger society. And what does he see? He sees the Babylonian surfaces of our life. He sees the opulence of it. And if he weren't sufficiently convinced of the opulence by what he sees in the ordinary shows on TV, the commercials convince him. He sees instantism: everything is presented to him as something you get instantly. The commercial products especially are instant, but the stories also, are about people who want things instantly and instantism is one of the lessons that he learns. He stretches out his hands to this opulent, sensual, affluent society wanting to get some of it instantly and, it recedes, of course. It's like the Greek myth of Tantalus, you stretch out your hands and it recedes--and the result is rage.

Tocqueville has pointed out, in his study of the French revolution, that great revolutions came in societies not when the condition of the people is at its worst, but when the condition is improving. And that pretty much

has been true in terms of the inner-city--conditions have actually been improving. In the beginning, before these new revolutionary changes, there was hopelessness. And the hopelessness went along with a certain kind of apathy and sullenness. That hopelessness was replaced by hope. But the trouble was that the hope has not been fulfilled. It has been anything but fulfilled. The result has been frustration along with the hope. The question, of course, for the future is, can we have hope without frustration. Because when you get hope with frustration the result is rage. You don't want rage, there has to be both hope, and at the same time some chance in the calculable future of fulfilling that hope without frustration, and the rages will die out. And I would not be candid with you if I said that I expect that to happen soon. I don't.

I'm taking now a very long-time view, and my view has to do basically with the whole process by which the blacks in America can come into the real inheritance of American life. That's going to take some time. The only chance that we have of avoiding violence on a larger scale is by making sure that this process becomes a more credible one. I think we're working at it; that is about the best I can say. People have often asked: what is the essence of this whole process of minority groups becoming part of the larger American structure. I've had an interesting experience; perhaps some of you have heard me say this in the past. I hope you'll forgive me if I repeat it. I was in India for a year teaching. I came back by way of eastern Europe and I stopped off at Warsaw for awhile. Some of the writers and other intellectuals there had a kind of evening for me. The chairman of the

evening got up; he said, "Mr. Lerner, you've written this massive book on American civilization. We haven't had a chance to have it translated, but could you tell us in a single word what is the essence of American civilization?" I said, "It's a book of a thousand pages; you want a thousand pages distilled into one word?" He said, "Yes, would you?" Have you ever had this thrown at you, in one word what is America? I thought very hard, very fast, what is it? Is it freedom, is it democracy, is it equality, is it tolerance, is it decency, is it justice, is it dynamism, is it enterprise? Suddenly almost to my surprise I heard myself say <u>access</u>. The chairman laughed. He said, "We've heard a lot about American success, we hadn't heard of access." I said, "You see, we have a Declaration of Independence that says all men are born free and equal. I hope we're born free and we'll remain free; we're not born equal, we're born with very unequal abilities and potentials." I said, "Every employer knows it, every teacher knows it, every parent knows it. I have a brood of children of my own and every one of them was born unequal. But," I said, "we also have the notion that there ought to be equal access to equal life chances, so that every unequally born youngster gets the chance to develop his unequal ability to the fullest. It is in this sense that access is the heart of the American experience."

I don't know of any definition of access that would elaborate it with any kind of clarity. It means equal chance at equal life chances. We've got to break into the ghettos to give people in the inner-city that kind of equal chance. We've got to make sure that they're no longer at the bottom of the pyramid, almost the only ones at the bottom of the pyramid, although

there are some others. We've got to make sure that the things they have been without, they will no longer be without--without power, without money incomes, without jobs, without skills, without a cultural tradition that they're proud of, without a sense of identity. If you're going to have to choose from these I would say the crucial ones have to do with money, to give them income, by getting jobs and skills. That would be number one. Number two is power. Some kind of participation in what's happening around them. Third is education in order to be able to prepare themselves. And fourth is a sense of identity.

I don't know in what sequence I would put those, but I do know some of my reactions to some of the efforts now being made in these directions by some of the more urgent groups among black Americans. For example, they put an enormous stress on power. And I can understand it, since they've been powerless. I can even understand black power, by the way, and commend it very much. For example, in Los Angeles a couple of months ago I was on the same platform with Tom Bradley, who was running for mayor of Los Angeles. I was very happy to have a chance to support him in his race there with Sam Yorty. I think it's going to be wonderful to have that kind of man. I said that kind of man, not talking about white or black, with his kind of experience and integrity and character, as mayor of Los Angeles. The fact that he's black makes it all the better, because in a symbolic way it shows you can get black power in this sense--just as it was shown in Cleveland by Stokes, just as it was shown in Gary by Hatcher, just as it was shown in Washington, D. C., just as it was shown in Massachusetts by Brooks or on

the Supreme Court by Thurgood Marshall.

This is black power, for me. But not black power in a prescriptive way. I don't like black power that is prescriptive just as I don't like white power that is prescriptive. I don't like black supremacy, just as I don't like white supremacy. But I do very much believe the powerlessness of the American blacks has to be replaced by sharing the power.

I have the same feeling, basically, about identity. I think one of the healthiest things that has developed in recent years has been the whole thrust towards pride of identity. I know that I never really came to terms with myself as a person until I had come to terms with the whole question of my ethnic origins as a Jew, the whole feeling of facing that, of trying to resolve what seemed for awhile conflicting claims between the subculture and the larger American culture. Eventually, I think I faced it and resolved it. Whoever has tried to do that knows the increased strength, the increased fertility, creativeness he gets from the process. This must be true of American blacks as well. They need a sense of pride in their ethnic identity, but this again must not be prescriptive. It's not a question of, having to hate the whites in order to feel that black is beautiful. It isn't necessary that you say to the whites "you've got to give us back what you've taken." James Forman led a group into Riverside Church in New York the other day and said to the whites, "Oh, the blacks want restitution, restitution!" Well, I can understand that in terms of a broad, historic principle. But I don't think that it can be done by walking into churches and saying to Protestants, Jews, Catholics, or whoever it may be, that there are all these millions of

dollars you've got to pay us back. I don't think you'll get genuine, valid restitution that way, and I don't think that the induced sense of guilt, which is necessary for this, is a very healthy thing. I think, basically, the problem is not so much direct restitution. The problem is the rebuilding of a society--going on with the series of changes, within the frame of consent, which will make it possible for blacks and whites to find out who they are, to achieve their potential, and live together!

And the same applies to the so-called generational struggle, or generational confrontation. The university is an ~~arean~~ arena today, more and more, as every college president knows. I've come to believe that the most dangerous single occupation in the United States today is that of being a college president, without much question. There's only one other that compares with it at all, and that's being a parent. I think both of them are dangerous, and dangerous in very similar ways, because both deal with growing organisms. Both have the obligation to make sure these organisms are not hurt beyond retrieval. Both have the obligation to try to create some kind of frame, within which changes and growth can take place, and within which the growth of freedom can take place. In that sense the two occupations have very real parallels.

I've been a teacher for a long time; I've had a succession of what I might call generaltions of students. I began teaching in 1932. In the 1930's I remember my students were very socially conscious. In the 1940's they were very career conscious. In the 1950's they were unconscious. If I had to make a choice between their being unconscious and what has happened to

them in the 1960's, I think I'd choose the 1960's, when they are very intensely socially conscious again, as in the 1930's. But I think I would say to them, as I've said to students for some time now, the question is not just are you socially conscious; the question is what do you do with it, where do you go, how do you do it?

I come to you from the wars, in a sense. You know we have a new kind of war correspondent these days. I was at Columbia last spring when that happened at Columbia. I was at Sorbonne soon after that, when it happened in Paris at the university there. I was in Chicago, at the Democratic national convention when the confrontation happened. I was at Cornell the other day when that happened there. I was at Brandeis awhile before that when we had our episode. I was at CCNY. I am a war correspondent; I come to you from the wars. And as I've traveled around among these wars I try to ask some questions, both of students and of administrators and faculty. You see, I can perhaps generalize a bit from what happened at Chicago. Perhaps best there. I was there as a columnist, and as a commentator, I thought I'd try to make an estimate of what had happened. When I got back to my home I tried to catch up with some of the columns that had been written by some of my colleagues. And as I read these columns, I must say, about what had happened in Chicago, I rubbed my eyes in disbelief. This was not what I'd seen. Because almost every one of them, and these were my colleagues somewhere to the right of me, perhaps, if you can call it that. At any rate almost every one of them described the scene in the same way; that is, the way the young people look--their abundance of hair, their side-

burns, their beards, their messy clothes, their smell, their stench. I read these things and I said, "My God, they're looking at the whole thing through the eyes of a sanitation engineer!"

Now, may I say, I believe in public health, very much, and public hygiene, but I also believe in mental health, which I think may be perhaps more crucial. What I saw was rather different. What I saw was the hunger for power among those who felt themselves powerless to stop the war, and to end the draft; the hunger for participation, for decision-making among those who felt themselves left out. I went back to one of my culture heros, Mr. Justice Holmes. He said a man must have a share in the passions and actions of his time, at the peril of being judged not to have lived. A hunger for participation, a hunger for fellowship, a hunger for belief. These are the hungers I saw. And may I say, I saw hungers on both sides. I saw hungers among the Chicago police, too. Hunger to be considered a human being, a hunger not to be called a racist pig. As someone said the best pig is a dead pig. Hunger not to be called a racist pig, a hunger for self-respect, or the crucial thing that a man carries around with him, his self-image. A hunger to be valued for the dangerous occupation that he is pursuing. I saw hungers there, too. And, of course, neither side saw the hungers of the other and what resulted was polarization of hatreds, and the final result was what we saw--one of the tragic events of recent years.

You see there are two universes that we live in when we talk of the generational conflict. One is the outer universe, the objective universe, and that applies to all of us; young and old, black and white, the objective

universe is the same for all of us. But the other is the inner universe, the subjective universe, the universe of our own inner minds and spirits, the window through which we look out at the outer universe. When I talk to my students, when I talk to my own sons, I know that our outer universe is the same but our inner universes are very different because mine was shaped in the breakdown of our economy, it was shaped during the Spanish civil war, it was shaped during the shadow of Nazism over the world and we saw the consequences of what happened when, let's say, The Weimar Republic was allowed to be destroyed. It was shaped at that time. It was shaped in the whole post-war era with our efforts to do something about Communist expansionism. That was when my inner universe was shaped. My sons and students, they don't remember it. They were'nt alive. They don't remember and on the whole they don't really care. They are not history-minded, they are not past-minded. One of the efforts I have to make as a teacher is to try to say that it is very difficult to do very much about the present and the future unless you try to learn something about what happened in the past, but this isn't true of them. And the result is, of course, that it's difficult to communicate--why shouldn't it be difficult to communicate?

I think two things are crucial--one is communication itself, and the other is trust. One of the things I say about the Lerner household, if I may be a little personal, is that the most important single article of furniture in the Lerner household is the kitchen refrigerator. The reason for that is, as my sons have grown up and been out late, and may I say

they've been out late, when they come back, I don't say where've you been, what've you done, when I was young we did it so and so. I'm there, also sitting up pretty late. We go to the kitchen, we raid the refrigerator, we sit down at the kitchen table, we talk. And I try to listen, I try to help them learn the art of listening, which is not very easy. One of the things I try to say to them is, "Look, there are many things we disagree on, but I want you to know something. No matter what our differences may be, there's never anything you can do to make me break my trust in you. And I hope there's nothing I'll be able to do to make you break your trust in me. Because if we lose trust there can be no communication. Communication is only an empty jangling of sounds. If we can retain trust, I think we can restore communication."

But, of course, what's happening now is the trust itself is being broken. It's being broken between the racial groups, it's being broken now between the generations.

I think it is rather crucial for us to understand both the short-run and the long-run things that can be done, that must be done, about that kind of violence on the college campuses. And while this comes very largely from some of the militant black groups, it comes also from the white radicals, so-called new left, the SDS, which, in turn, is dominated by one of its own minorities, progressive labor, which is Maoist oriented, Casker White oriented. Mr. Garelik, who used to be chief inspector of the New York police and is now running with John Lindsay in the mayoralty race, gave an interview yesterday in which he said something about the funds from abroad

that some of these radical student movements get. Because the reaction was very sharp and swift Mayor Lindsay made him withdraw what he had said. I don't think, I don't know that there are funds from abroad. I don't think it's important. I don't think funds are the important thing, but I think the objectives are important. And for a group like progressive labor there's very little question that the objectives are not to make the college better, not to rebuild the college, but the objective is to destroy the college. The objective is to try to use the Negro situation in the colleges, use them as allies if possible, and try to reach through them to reach the Negro mass in the inner-city, because it's part of their basic theory of revolution. And then they're serious about revolution in America in the first sense--the classical, historical sense. It's part of their basic theory of revolution that the revolutionary group today is two: one, the Negro masses, and second, the intellectuals in the colleges.

One of the things they share with some of the more militant of the Negro groups that have been violent on the campuses has been the feeling that if your objective is high enough, then your means don't count. And in terms of means, anything goes. The true believer is so certain that he has a pipeline to the divine, the infinite, that he doesn't have to worry about the means he uses. And in the case both of the black militants, especially those who've used guns as at Cornell, and in the case of the progressive labor group, and the SDS, this is true. I have tried to say several things to these young people on a succession of college campuses as I've talked with them, and I have talked with them. First thing I've said is, "Look, I'm glad to

see your activism, I believe in activism. Why don't you go back to what Henri Bergson once said when he was asked to give a paper at a congress of philosophers, and couldn't give a paper. He sent a message of a single sentence. The message read, 'Act as men of thought, think as men of action.'" What I say to these young people is, "Sure, act, but act out a context of reflective thinking. Act as men of thought. Otherwise your action will be blind and destructive. And, yes, you're here at college to think. It's very good to think as men of action, very, very good, but make sure you make the connection between thought and action." The second thing I say to them is, "Look, if you are really revolutionary, then you'd better take the consequences."

When the SDS group walked out of Fayrweather Hall at Columbia, when they were served with an injunction and they decided to vacate Fayrweather Hall, I don't know how many of you caught a picture of them as they walked out and near the cameras: they covered their faces with their coats. Suddenly it hit me I'd seen things like that before. The Mafia operators, for example, and pictures of them covering their faces with their coats.

Surely these young people, if they are revolutionaries, ought to take pride in being revolutionaries. I don't think you can have it both ways. And if you're going to be revolutionaries, don't expect that the society will accommodate you, either the administrators or faculty of the universities, or the officials of the society. There's no suicide impulse built into America. If you're really going to be revolutionaries, then it's a showdown of power.

And there are some, by the way, who feel this way. I don't know how many. The story is that among the Bolsheviks that took over power in Russia, there weren't more than a few tens of thousands. But, of course, what was true of Russia was that the rest of the society was in collapse, that those who were governing were no longer able to govern, and those who were being governed were unwilling to be governed. I don't think that's true of American society. And I think that most of the revolutionary theory we're hearing today does not reckon with these facts.

I say one more thing to these young people--I say, "I've got three questions for you. What is your heroism, what is your notion of what is heroic, and who do you think is the enemy? That's number one. We knew who the enemy was in the days when I was at college and a young instructor, and I think we located the enemy in a crucial way. The enemy was concentrated power, the enemy was poverty, the enemy was Nazism, and so on. I think we knew who, what out heroism was. Secondly, what are your limits? What means do you use and where do you stop? Or is there no place where you stop? And third, what is your Jerusalem? Remember William Blake said, "We must build Jerusalem on England's green and shining land." What is your Jerusalem?

Sometimes I get answers to the first, I do not get answers to the second, I very rarely get answers to the third about Jerusalem.

There are some very real questions that we have to ask and I want to end with this one question. What are they doing? Why do they do it? And instead of trying to give you a particular answer, I've tried to round up

some theories as to why they do it. About seven of them. There are three that have to do with the society itself.

One theory is that this society is too affluent. Because it is affluent, there has not been any real confrontation forced on these young people in their early years, with poverty, with difficulties. They have no memory of social reality. There's no willingness, in psychiatric terms, to face the reality principle, which means postponing present gratification for future needs. The second is that it is a sick society, and a violent society. The violence is built in. It is to be found in the wars that we wage and don't seem to be able to stop. It is built into the very nature of our society. It is built into our nuclear weapons, and this violence spills over into the thinking of the young. The third is that it is a society with an empty value structure. The values we teach and preach are not very rewarding. They're not very nutritive to the young, who don't believe in them.

Those are the three theories that have to do with the nature of our society. There are two theories that have to do with the American family. One is that the family has been too permissive. David Riesman says this generation of college students is the first generation that was picked up when they cried as babies. Permissive in that sense, with a desire for instant gratification. The second family theory is not that it's a permissive family structure but a too-repressive partly-family and partly-social structure. That it hasn't given enough freedom for genuine personal theories of what happens in the growing up years, that there has been a distortion of identification, that the young people who need someone to identify with have not

had a healthy identification model. The father, for example, was the healthy model for a boy in the earlier republic. The boy knew what the father was doing. He was proud of it. He identified with the father's work. He often followed him. That's no longer true. The boy rarely knows what it is that the father does, doesn't have a chance really to identify with the work or with the father, and cuts himself away from him. The father is not often around and even when he is around, his emotional and intellectural authority is not there. This means a distortion of identification in the sense that since there is no real object to identify with, when the rebellion phase comes, it is directed not against the identification object, but against the whole society, against the older generation.

And finally, there is the Bettelheim theory of protracted adolescence: what's been happening is a longer educational track; that while puberty is a biological fact, adolescence is not a biological but a social fact. That the years after puberty are very long years which the young people spend waiting, waiting for something that doesn't happen. They are not moving into the immediate process of some of their predecessors in previous generations, of jobs and raising families, but waiting, waiting--a little like waiting for Godot.

Now I don't know which of these theories is valid; I suspect there's some truth in most of them. I think we would have to draw some kind of circle through them to see what part of each of them could be included with some kind of consistency in a single circle. My own stress would be on the identification, my stress would be on the absence of the reality principle in

their lives and finally my stress would be on the long process of adolescence. I don't think we should deal with these young people on the college campuses as if they were so much material to manipulate. They are organisms. They are the real growth material of our society. The question is how to create some kind of a setting within which they can carry on this learning process and teaching process in a healthy way. This means, as I suggested, growing some kind of circle outside of which they cannot go. And that means the student bodies and the faculty and the administration in every college must learn how to hold together, to reach decisions together. It means the colleges must be kept open and not closed down. It means the police must not be called except as a last resort. But that doesn't mean, by the way, never called, because the time may come when there is no other way. It means the injunction process, which has been used so very well in the University of Chicago and at Columbia recently. It means that even more basically the colleges themselves as organisms must use their own laws of life. The ultimate sanction must be the college sanction in terms of suspension, or exclusion. Young people are always not only welcome, they are nurtured; we cherish them on the campus, but not if they want to destroy the organism of the university. Those who want to destroy the organism of the university have to take the consequences.

But while this is happening one other process must happen: and that is we must move into a new era of constitution-making on the university campuses, because the political structure of the university has grown archaic. Just as surely as we needed a new era in the late 1780's for our political

fabric as a nation, so we need a new era of constitution-making on the campuses, with the tripartite pooling of decision-making by all groups involved.

I still call myself a possibilist. I think these things can be done if we use collective intelligence and collective will. As I have moved around the country recently more and more people have said to me, "Mr. Lerner, up there in space, do you think there's intelligent life? And do you think we'll ever be able to communicate with intelligent life in space?" And I say, "That's a fascinating question, but I have another question of a higher order of priority. Not is there intelligent life up there in space, but is there intelligent life down here on earth? And not will we ever be able to communicate with space, but will we ever be able to communicate with each other--nation with nation, race with race, generation with generation."